

<b>Delegated Report</b>  <b>Refusal</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		11/01/2021	
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		10/01/2021	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number</b>			
Obote Hope				2020/5310/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
Ground Floor Flat, 4 Savernake Road London NW3 2JN				See decision notice			
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>				
<b>Proposal</b>							
The erection of a single storey extension to the rear and side elevations at ground floor level.							
<b>Recommendation:</b>		Refuse Planning Permission					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. of responses		00	No. of objections		00
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		A site notice was displayed from 16/12/2020 to 09/01/2020. Press notice was published on 17/12/2020 to 10/01/2020.					
<b>CAAC/Local groups comments:</b>		No comment/objection was received at the time of this report.					
<b>Site Description</b>							
<p>The application site is located on the north side of Savernake Road east of Lisburne Road and almost at the point where the road follows westwards into Constantine Road. It is located within the Mansfield Conservation Area. The site comprises a three storey semi-detached property divided into flats. The host building, as with all others in this street, is considered to make a positive contribution to the conservation area.</p> <p>According to the Mansfield Conservation Area Statement, the houses along Savernake Road are flat fronted with a projecting bay window over two storeys, recessed paired entrance doors, visible pitched roofs and prominent chimneystacks and party walls, and original two or three storey part-width rear extensions. The quality and variety of materials and level of detailing applied to each terrace gives an indication of its original status within the hierarchy of the estate. Moreover, no. 4 reads as a pair with no.2; despite their setting in the road, with a break in terms of frontage and building line from neighbouring properties to the west and east, the elevations of both properties give strong rhythm and consistency to the other properties.</p>							

## Relevant History

### Application Site:

**2018/4898/P** – Planning permission for the Loft conversion including installation of a dormer and rooflight on the rear roofslope and two rooflights on the front roofslope. **Refused** planning permission on 07/02/2019.

### Reasons for refusal:

*‘The proposed rear dormer roof extension, by reason of its design, size, materials, location and setting on a group of buildings with a largely unaltered roofline, would result in harm to the character and appearance of the building, the group of buildings of which it forms part, and the Mansfield Conservation Area, contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017’.*

## Relevant policies

### National Planning Policy Framework 2019

The London Plan March 2016, consolidated with alterations since 2011  
Publication London Plan December 2020

### Camden Local Plan 2017

Policy A1 Managing the impact of development  
Policy CC2 Adapting to Climate change  
Policy D1 Design  
Policy D2 Heritage

### Camden Planning Guidance

Amenity (January 2021)  
Design (January 2021)  
Biodiversity (2018)  
Home Improvement (January 2021)

Mansfield Conservation Area Statement 2008

## Assessment

### 1. Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear and side extension with lightwell to the flank elevation.

1.2 The key considerations are as follows:

- Design and Appearance
- Tree
- Residential Amenities

### 2.0 Design and Appearance

2.1 The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments, including where alterations and extensions are proposed. Policy D1 requires extensions to consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings; and the character and proportions of the existing building. Camden's design policies are supported by Camden Planning Guidance Design. Camden Planning Guidance document Home Improvements advises that extensions should be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale and proportion.

2.2 Paragraph 2.1.1 of CPG (Home Improvements) states that side extensions should be designed in accordance with the general considerations of the Conservation Area Statement. This states that extensions should be secondary to the building in terms of location, form, scale, proportions and detailing. Page 29 of The Mansfield Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (MCAAMS) 2008 also states, within the Mansfield Conservation Area there are many interesting examples of historic rear elevations. The original

historic pattern of rear elevations within a street or group of buildings is an integral part of the character of the area and as such rear extensions will not be acceptable where they would diverge significantly from the historic pattern.

2.3 Most explicitly paragraphs 185 and 192 require that local planning authorities should take into account "the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness". The design policies further reinforce the objective of enhancement of an area's character and local distinctiveness, concluding that "Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area..." (paragraph 130).

2.4 The conservation area predominantly comprises terraced housing that was built in the late Victorian period. The Mansfield Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (MCAAMS) 2008 notes that the majority of the houses 'conform to one basic plan form and period of development', and it is this consistency and uniformity of design that characterises the residential parts of the conservation area.

2.5 A few of the properties have been altered at the rear on the north side where the host building is located, and many of the brick closets remains. Thus, the historic layout of the plot and the form and design of the rear wing can still be discerned at No 4. The MCAAMS highlights the important contribution of historic rear elevations to the character of streets and groups of buildings, and states that rear extensions that would diverge significantly from the historic pattern will not be acceptable.

### **3.0 Rear Extensions**

3.1 The proposal would add a single storey extension to the side elevation of the property which would diverge from the established historic pattern in two ways. Firstly, the new extension would entirely block off the passageway, which is a key element of the layout of the plot. Secondly, it would increase the width of the rear wing to beyond that of the main house, which is at odds with the established subservient form of the rear wing. By detracting from the uniformity of design of the semi-detached pair.

3.2 The proposed ground floor rear extension would measure 2.0m from the rear elevation of the closet wing with a width of 6.2m (across the width of the entire garden). The ground floor side extension would measure 6.4m along the boundary wall from the rear elevation of the closet wing. A new lightwell is proposed to allow natural light into the bedroom measuring approximately 1.6m in depth and 1.9m in width and the eaves height of the ground floor "wrap around" would measure 2.3m with a pitched roof rising to a terminating height of 3.1m. The extensions at ground floor level would also be designed with 2x rooflights along the flank elevation.

3.3 Overall, it is considered that the proposed extension would alter the character and appearance of the existing building. The proposed extension would, by reason of its design, siting, bulk and footprint, detract from the general scale and proportions of the host building and would have a detrimental impact upon the rear elevation and is unacceptable. Although the rear addition in itself could be considered acceptable in itself as having minimal impact on the building bulk or neighbour amenity, the side extension in conjunction with this is considered excessive, especially given the large size of the property itself already here.

3.4 The proposal for a full width and wrap around extension at ground floor level that would be overly dominant to the host building and is not considered to remain secondary or subordinate to the host building. As such, the ground floor works due to the excessive depth of the side extension to form the wrap around would therefore be contrary to the MCAAMS which requires extension to preserve or enhance the historic character of the area.

3.5 The proposal would be contrary to Policy D2 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017 which seeks preserves or enhances the historic environment and heritage assets. The proposal also conflicts with Policy D1, which seeks to respects local context and character and seeks to secure high quality design which the preserves the relationship between the building. Moreover, the Council's policies for developments in a Conservation Area are aimed at preserving or enhancing the special character and appearance of the area. Which would not be the case in this instance.

3.6 Special attention has been paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Belsize Conservation Area, under s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act (ERR) 2013.

## **4.0 Tree**

4.1 Policy A2 and A3 both seek to protect areas of green open space (including private gardens) that are value both in terms of the townscape as well as ecology from detrimental harm. Policy CC3 also seeks to ensure that development avoids harm to the local water environment.

4.2 The Local Plan (2017) requires that new developments respond to the natural assets of a site and its surroundings, such as slopes and height differences, trees and other vegetation. In addition, all new development should promote biodiversity, contribute to the amenity of an area and development that is likely to damage trees would not be supported.

4.3 The proposed plan has not included an accurate detail of the rear garden and the impact if any the proposal would have on mature tree/s to the rear of the host building and neighbouring properties. This would be contrary to the Local Plan 2017 which requires require trees and vegetation to be retained to be satisfactorily protected during the demolition and construction phase of development in line with BS5837:2012 'Trees in relation to Design, Demolition and Construction' and positively integrated as part of the site layout. Thus, the lack of detail to demonstrate that the tree/s would be retained and adequately protected would form a reason for refusal.

## **5.0 Residential Amenity**

5.1 Development should not cause a loss of amenity to adjacent properties with regard to sunlight, daylight, outlook, overshadowing, light pollution/spillage, privacy/overlooking and sense of enclosure in accordance with CPG Amenities and planning policy A1 of the Local Plan.

5.2 The rear extension, on account of its depth, would not cause any loss of light or outlook to adjoining windows of no.2. The side extension would have a 2.2m high wall behind the existing garden boundary wall and this would not cause any loss of light to no. 2; in addition, the depth and extent of this side extension, on account of this height and depth is unlikely to cause any loss of outlook.

## **6.0 Conclusion:**

6.1 Overall, the development has been carefully assessed by the Council and is considered unacceptable on a number of principle grounds. The design of the proposed extension would fail to account of the local context a given its design, bulk, visibility and location, would be incongruous additions to the local townscape and wider area. Adequate tree protection would fail to be sustainable design and construction. The proposal would have a cumulative impact that would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area and would be contrary policies D1 (Design) and D2 (heritage) of Camden Local Plan 2017.

6.2 Insufficient information has been submitted in relation to the impacts of the proposed ground floor extension may have on the proposed tree, there is no supporting information for the Local Planning Authority to ascertain whether the tree would be harmed contrary to policy A3 (Biodiversity) of the Camden Local Plan 2017.

## **7.0 Refusal is therefore recommended.**